

October 14, 2005  
Case No. GP-303943 (2760/124)  
Serial No.: 10/691,871  
Filed: October 23, 2003  
Page 7 of 10

**- REMARKS -**

Support for new claims 18 and 19 is found, *inter alia*, on pages 15-16 of the specification. New claims 18 and 19 are patentable over the prior art because each and every element of claims 18 and 19 is not disclosed, taught, or suggested in as great detail as claimed by the prior art.

**A. Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9-11, 14, 15, and 17 were rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Mizikovsky in view of Brennan**

The rejections to claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9-11, 14, 15, and 17 are traversed. In order to maintain this obviousness rejection, each and every claim limitation must be taught or suggested, in as great detail as claimed, by the references, alone or in combination.

At a minimum, Mizikovsky in view of Brennan fails to teach or suggest "determining an answer mode based on the origin identifier of the incoming call signal" as claimed in claims 1, 9, and 17. The Examiner relies on Mizikovsky for such a teaching, but at most, Mizikovsky teaches response categories including a "distinctive type of ringing indication", "muted ringing alert", or "accessory response" (column 6, lines 30-33, 44-50, 51-52) rather than determining an answer mode. Thus, Mizikovsky teaches only determining how to announce the incoming call based on the ANI, rather than determining the answer mode. Brennan does not cure this defect.

October 14, 2005  
Case No. GP-303943 (2760/124)  
Serial No.: 10/691,871  
Filed: October 23, 2003  
Page 8 of 10

Additionally, however, Mizikovsky in view of Brennan fails to teach or suggest determining a first answer mode when the origin identifier is within a predetermined group of origin identifiers and determining a second answer mode when the origin identifier is not with the predetermined group of origin identifiers as claimed in claims 3 and 11. At most, Mizikovsky in view of Brennan teaches determining if an origin identifier matches a particular origin identifier. The Examiner relies on Brennan for such a teaching, and Mizikovsky fails to cure this defect. What Brennan does teach is:

main controller 34. In a case where the incoming stored data includes a decoded telephone number (e.g., 111-111-1111) or decoded name (i.e., YES in step 63), the main controller 34 compares the decoded telephone number (or, if no telephone number, the decoded name) to the telephone numbers (or names) previously entered into the telephone directory 48 (step 64). If there is a match—i.e., the decoded telephone number (or name) matches a telephone number (or name) in one of the records in telephone directory 48—(i.e., YES in step 64), the name in the matching record is read from the telephone directory 48 by the main controller 34. The read name is a series of ASCII characters. The

15

20

Brennan does not compare the received identifier to a range of identifiers, but rather a series of individual identifiers. Therefore, Brennan does not teach the claimed element, and Mizikovsky does not cure this defect.

Claims 2-3, 6, 7, 10-11, 14, and 15 depend directly or indirectly from one of claims 1 or 9, and are therefore patentable over Mizikovsky in view of Brennan for at least the same reasons.

Therefore, claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9-11, 14, 15 and 17 are patentable over Mizikovsky in view of Brennan for at least the above reasons. Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9-11, 14, 15 and 17 is requested.

October 14, 2005  
Case No. GP-303943 (2760/124)  
Serial No.: 10/691,871  
Filed: October 23, 2003  
Page 9 of 10

**B. Claims 4, 5, 8, 12, 13, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizikovsky in view of Brennan in further view of Park**

The §103(a) rejection of claims 4, 5, 8, 12, 13, and 16 is traversed.

Claims 4, 5, 8, 12, 13, and 16 depend directly or indirectly from one of claims 1 or 9, and are therefore patentable over Mizikovsky in view of Brennan in further view of Park for at least the same reasons.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 4, 5, 8, 12, 13, and 16 is requested.

October 14, 2005  
Case No. GP-303943 (2760/124)  
Serial No.: 10/691,871  
Filed: October 23, 2003  
Page 10 of 10

**SUMMARY**

The Examiner's rejections of claims 1-17 have been obviated by remarks herein supporting an allowance of pending claims 1-17 over the art of record. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-19 herein fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: October 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,  
STEVEN P. SCHWINKE, ET. AL.

GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION  
General Motors Legal Staff  
Mail Code 482-C23-B21  
300 Renaissance Center  
P.O. Box 300  
Detroit, MI 58265-3000  
Phone: (313) 665-4714

---

Anthony Luke Simon  
Registration No. 34,434  
Attorney for Applicant



---

Frank C. Nicholas  
Registration No. 33,983  
Attorney for Applicant

CARDINAL LAW GROUP  
Suite 2000  
1603 Orrington Avenue  
Evanston, Illinois 60201  
Phone: (847) 905-7111  
Fax: (847) 905-7113